

**THE ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION**

Summary Minutes of the Forty-ninth Meeting
September 4, 2007

The Forty-ninth Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH or the Board) was held telephonically on September 4, 2007. The meeting was called by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the agency chartered with administering the ABRWH. These summary minutes, as well as a verbatim transcript certified by a court reporter, are available on the internet on the NIOSH/Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS) web site located at www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas.

Those present included the following:

Board Members:

Dr. Paul Ziemer, Chair; Ms. Josie Beach; Mr. Bradley Clawson; Mr. Michael Gibson; Mr. Mark Griffon; Dr. James Lockey; Dr. James Melius; Ms. Wanda Munn; Mr. Robert Presley; Dr. Genevieve Roessler; and Mr. Phillip Schofield.

Designated Federal Official: Dr. Lewis Wade, Executive Secretary.

Federal Agency Attendees:

Department of Health and Human Services:

Dr. Christine Branche, Ms. Chia-Chia Chang, Office of the Director of NIOSH; Dr. James Neton, Mr. David Sundin, OCAS; Mr. David Staudt, Contracting Office; Ms. Emily Howell, Ms. Liz Homoki-Titus, Office of General Counsel.

Department of Labor: Mr. Jeff Kotsch.

Contractors:

Dr. Bob Anigstein, Mr. Joe Fitzgerald, Dr. Arjun Makhijani, Dr. John Mauro, and Dr. Steve Ostrow, Sanford Cohen & Associates.

Other Participants:

Representing workers and/or petitioners: Dr. Dan McKeel, Mr. John Ramspott, Ms. Mary Ann Reale.

* * * * *

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The forty-ninth meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health began with **Dr. Lewis Wade**, Designated Federal Official, taking a call of the roll of the Board members. Members present were **Ms. Josie Beach**, **Mr. Michael Gibson**, **Mr. Mark Griffon**, **Dr. James Lockey**, **Dr. James Melius**, **Ms. Wanda Munn**, **Mr. Robert Presley**, **Dr. Genevieve Roessler**, and **Dr. Paul Ziemer**, with **Mr. Bradley Clawson** and **Mr. Phillip Schofield** joining soon after. Absent was **Dr. John Poston**.

Participants representing federal agencies identified themselves as noted above. No one from the Department of Energy indicated presence, nor did any member of Congress or their representatives. Workers and/or petitioners were represented as indicated above.

With a quorum of members present, Board chairman **Dr. Paul Ziemer** officially called the meeting to order and asked that everyone verify that they had available a copy of the agenda which had been e-mailed from **Dr. Wade** with suggested time for each item.

* * * * *

REPORT OF MEMBER VOTES RECORDED SINCE LAST BOARD MEETING

The meeting began with an informational report from **Dr. Wade** concerning votes recorded since the last Board meeting. Board policy on votes related to issues which will result in a recommendation to the Secretary of HHS is that votes will be counted at the meeting, and any Board members absent at the time of the vote will be contacted by **Drs. Wade** and **Ziemer** following the meeting and their vote will be solicited.

There were a few issues on which that type of vote had been taken earlier. The first was that in the July meeting the Board voted to deny a Special Exposure Cohort petition on Chapman Valve, Petition No. 43. The recorded vote was six to five. **Drs. Wade** and **Ziemer** met with the absent Board member, **Mr. Bradley Clawson**, who voted against the majority, making the final vote six to six. That results in placing the Board in a deadlock situation relative to the Chapman Valve SEC petition. How to proceed with this issue will have to be decided by the Board when next they meet in October. The result of the vote is the motion to send the Secretary a recommendation denying the petition failed, therefore there is no recommendation to go forward.

The next such vote was on Petition Number 75 dealing with the Ames, Iowa facility for the covered period of January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1970. The original vote was 11 to zero to approve the petition. **Mr. Clawson**, absent at the time of the vote, supported the Board's decision when contacted so that the final vote is a unanimous 12 to zero.

Next was Petition Number 57 on Hanford, covering the period of '43 to '46. The vote at the meeting was eight to zero to approve, with two members abstaining based on conflict of interest. Board members **Mr. Clawson** and **Dr. Lockey** both voted in favor of the petition when their votes were subsequently secured, making the final tally ten to zero.

The last situation involved the three Rocky Flats petitions, the first one in May and the other two at the June meeting. The first related to a Board motion to approve a class of workers exposed to neutron dose from April 1, 1952 to December 31, 1958. The Board voted to approve the petition by a vote of seven to three. **Dr. Poston** was not present and his vote, when secured, was an affirmative vote, resulting in a final tally of eight to three for approval.

The second Board motion, taken up in June, was to approve a class of workers exposed to thorium dose from January 1, 1959 to December 31, 1966. The Board vote was eight to one, with one abstention. When contacted subsequently, **Dr. Poston** voted against the motion, making the final vote eight to two.

The third vote, also in June, was a vote to deny adding a class for the entire covered period not mentioned by the other two petitions. The Board vote at the meeting was six to four. When contacted, **Dr. Poston** voted with the majority, making the final vote to deny seven to four.

In none of the cases noted above did the subsequent votes of absent members change the outcome of the vote, but this information is provided to make the vote tally complete.

* * * * *

**UPDATE ON SC&A REVIEW OF TBD-6000 and
GENERAL STEEL INDUSTRIES APPENDIX**

Ms. Wanda Munn set the stage by noting that the procedures workgroup she chairs had discussed this document during their recent meeting. At that time they were provided with some specifics about the fact that SC&A has essentially completed their review. Outstanding issues were appendices that had not had a thorough vetting following the significant amount of data provided by petitioners subsequent to the release of the document and subsequent to the SC&A review.

There is some concern about the amount of work necessarily to thoroughly vet the addenda, and concern among Board members relative to the SC&A budget and its adequacy to cover such a review. **Ms. Munn** indicated it is the understanding of the workgroup that SC&A believes they will be able to review those significant items relative to the documents within the scope of their current budget.

It is the desire of the workgroup that a request be made for SC&A to go forward, and the workgroup had agreed to bring that issue before the Board during this call. Their recommendation is that the contractor continue with the review in light of the fact that there will be no budgetary impact.

Dr. John Mauro agreed with the accuracy of **Ms. Munn's** summary, and confirmed the review of TBD-6000 is virtually complete. SC&A hopes to have it in the hands of the Board within a week or so. He noted there are findings the working group and the Board will need to discuss.

As to Appendix BB, **Dr. Mauro** reported SC&A is in the process of reviewing a great deal of information, getting to the point where they now have a fuller appreciation of the level of analysis needed. They anticipate they will be able to complete all the work within the existing budget. A bit more time will probably be needed relative to Appendix BB.

Dr. Bob Anigstein, who is taking the lead on that review, is in the process of digesting all the information and getting the runs in order. He indicated his best estimate for having a draft report ready for the Board would be sometime in October, elaborating on some of the issues that were somewhat time-consuming.

* * *

Discussion Points:

- Is all the information from **Mr. Ramspott** and **Dr. McKeel** available to **Dr. Anigstein**;
- An update or progress report on the review will be needed in the October Board meeting;
- Whatever is done should also reflect the working conditions at General Steel Industries, both in terms of shielding, locations, beam-flattening devices, et cetera;
- Complexities attendant to the review relative to some 500 pages of testimony from worker outreach meetings;

- The bottom-line request from the workers is that the Board look at the workgroup's recommendation, which is to proceed as outlined, authorizing SC&A to continue the work discussed.

* * *

The recommendation from the workgroup to the Board that the work proceed as described has the force of a motion not requiring a second.

Dr. Ziemer declared the motion directing the contractor to proceed on the review of Appendix BB to TBD-6000 open for discussion.

Dr. Wade and **Mr. David Staudt** confirmed that there were no budgetary or statutory issues of concern at this point.

The motion carried by a vote of 10 to zero.

* * * * *

REPORT ON SC&A'S CONTRACT TASKS FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR

The discussion was led by **Dr. Wade** and **Mr. Staudt**, the contracting officer. They reported they have been working to get the contractor tasks for the next fiscal year developed. **Mr. Staudt** remarked that modifications to the five task orders are in place, as approved by the Board at the last meeting, in terms of both the work product and the budgetary values.

Dr. Mauro raised a question to both **Mr. Staudt** and the Board in that during the last working group meeting OTIB-54, which deals with fission products, was mentioned. The workgroup was interested in having that reviewed, and there was a question whether that should be done in the current budget or wait until next fiscal year. **Mr. Staudt** indicated SC&A can proceed right now with that review, subject to Board approval.

Relative to where that review stood on the priority list, **Ms. Munn** reported the procedures workgroup had discussed it briefly and it was the general feeling SC&A should move forward, but not to set aside any other priority items in its favor. It is a high priority, but there is no urgency. She added she had also understood from that meeting that OTIB-54 could be incorporated into material SC&A is looking at, without any major disruption of priorities already established.

* * * * *

DISCUSSION OF FIRST STEPS TOWARD A BOARD CONTRACTOR FOR FY'09 AND BEYOND

Dr. Wade announced another issue under the contract is that it will reach the end of its five-year term at the end of fiscal year '08, and there is a requirement for a request to bid for the next period of time. This means SC&A will have until September to work on the Board's business and for the government to secure a contractor to carry into fiscal year '09 and beyond. He wanted **Mr. Staudt** to speak to the issue and alert the Board to it, and in October would like to have a detailed discussion where the Board would make its wishes known as to how it would like to proceed.

Mr. Staudt agreed October would be a time to discuss two primary things: the statement of work and the evaluation criteria. A number of things have changed over the years and the statement of work will need to be modified somewhat, citing the SEC review as an example. By the January meeting **Mr. Staudt** would look forward to the Board approving the statement of work and the evaluation criteria so that his group in the contract office can publish the information, noting the process takes about six months from that point to award. That has to be done in order for the next contractor to keep the ball rolling the following October.

Mr. Staudt remarked that in January he would like the Board to give his office the green light to proceed with the solicitation process.

Dr. Wade asked for a sense of the Board as to how they would like to be involved in the evaluation process, and all of that needs to be talked through. He noted that Board members could be on the evaluation panel, or they could act as advisors to the panel. **Mr. Staudt** commented the panel shouldn't be too big -- about six or eight, depending on complexity -- but he agreed there is time to work on that. It's something to be thinking about in October.

Board options suggested by **Dr. Wade** were that the Board could come together in October with a blank piece of paper and discuss statement of work or evaluation criteria; or if they prefer, he and **Mr. Staudt** could work together to assemble a first draft.

* * *

Discussion Points:

- If the original statement of work were modified by **Dr. Wade** and **Mr. Staudt** and presented to the Board in October, that would be a starting point;
- A suggestion that the contracting officer make an effort to note areas where his office sees a need for change, particularly with direction of focus in the coming years;

- An effort should be made to have that document to the Board at least a week before the October meeting;
- A discussion of the bidding process and sample tasks;
- Once the bids are in and the technical proposals sent to an evaluation panel, a competitive range would be developed to reduce proposals to two or three, which are then reviewed for their cost and potentially discussions with those bidders;
- The evaluation panel will look at the type of labor mix proposed and the costs involved, number of hours, et cetera;
- A certain percentage of the panel would be required to have the federal procurement training;
- Availability of training for an interested Board member who might need it to qualify for the panel;
- The evaluation panel will not be exclusively a Board panel;
- As much of the process will be done publicly as possible, but confidentiality will apply to discussion of labor rates.

* * * * *

UPDATE ON ROCKY FLATS FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

Dr. James Neton from NIOSH reminded the Board that at the June meeting in Colorado NIOSH was asked how long it would take to evaluate the Rocky Flats claims against the new approaches proposed during the working group's deliberations. Those proposals were relative to super S plutonium, the 95th percentile for unmonitored internal dose for workers, and a proposed new neutron dose model.

Dr. Neton declared NIOSH had been working as quickly as possible and they have completed the internal/external site profile document revision. They were reviewed and approved mid-August and are on the web site, meaning there is no impediment to proceeding to complete those dose reconstructions. Any new cases coming forward are currently being processed against those revisions.

At the July meeting in Richland, **Dr. Neton** reminded the Board, he had provided an update and at that time there were 672 Rocky Flats cases that had PCs less than 50 percent. Since that time they've been working through the backlog and find most of those cases would have to be evaluated against the super S plutonium change. The number of those RF cases under 50 percent is now down to 610.

Evaluating against the revisions has been more difficult than originally anticipated because one issue has to do with identification of which cases are actually in the SEC class added at Rocky Flats. That is not yet closed, though **Dr. Neton** indicated he thought the SEC

designation is scheduled to be effective sometime during the week, probably September 6. Until then, there is some problem determining which cases to rework.

Equally important is the issue of how to factor in all the technical changes made in the program not directly related to Rocky Flats. NIOSH doesn't want to do the reworks in a vacuum and evaluate against just the three RF changes, but want to incorporate all the other changes to site procedures and technical documents.

As a result NIOSH has had discussions with DOL and DOL has agreed they will send back all Rocky Flats cases that have been denied to date. That will add to the 610 cases but they will be done using not just the RF changes but all changes that might impact from other evaluations done.

Letters will be sent to those claimants as NIOSH receives them, notifying the claimant of what is happening. The cases will be reworked completely, including the closeout interview. DOL sends the claimants a letter saying it's being returned for a rework, and will make it clear that not all will be successful as far as raising their POCs. **Dr. Neton** remarked that part of their discussions with DOL had been that it was important not to raise false hopes.

* * *

Discussion Points:

- A question on designating the neutron buildings and whether anyone had worked with DOL on it;
- The definition of "monitored or should have been monitored for neutrons" had been purposefully left vague because there were several buildings where the Board wanted to be sure more research was done and the designation was appropriate;
- There will be time on the October meeting agenda for a general Rocky Flats update;
- Whether, in the group classified as neutron workers, consideration was being given to workers who were roving maintenance workers;
- The test normally applied by DOL in the past for workers to be considered for addition to a class was whether there was potential for a worker to receive a 100 millirem exposure;
- Perhaps someone from DOL can be present in October to answer those types of questions.

* * * * *

REPORT ON PRIVACY ACT CLEARANCE PROCEDURES

Discussion centered around procedures currently being followed, and have been approved internally. There is no requirement for the Board to approve the SC&A procedures, but **Dr. Wade** indicated they're open to suggestions and comments as to how to improve them. At the October meeting the Board will be provided with matrices to show the status of all such items and identify backlogs to track performance relative to the procedure.

Some of the documents to be discussed had been issued and then retracted, and some Board members had not received subsequent information that they were being redistributed without change. As a result, it was decided that these could be discussed again in October with updates provided.

It was noted there were some federal changes as to how redactions are done, being a little tighter than in past years. Since this will have to be discussed again in October, **Dr. Wade** suggested the Board consider this an informational item.

* * *

Discussion Points:

- Concern expressed because the Privacy Act issue was poorly organized and not well communicated, with a major concern being how the public gets information about Board deliberations;
- Concern about the availability of both Board and workgroup meeting transcripts being placed on the web site for public view;
- FACA does not require workgroup meetings be public or that transcripts or minutes be taken of those meetings or that any work products be made public;
- The Board could decide not to hold workgroups unless all the documents to be discussed were cleared, which might delay workgroup meetings as they're working through various reviews;
- A belief that Board business should be conducted in a manner consistent with the desire to be transparent in anything that is done;
- A query whether the Board would like there to be no discussion of documents until all were publicly available, which is not the current procedure;
- This is an issue to be discussed, but doesn't have to be decided today;
- Clarification of an earlier concern to mean it is not necessary that all documents become public because they're discussed, but before

the Board makes a decision on major documents -- such as an SC&A report or NIOSH response -- those should be publicly available to interested parties in a timely manner;

- A suggestion that there be some information available about exactly what documents are discussed at various meetings, even though they may not be available and may never be publicly available, as a way for the public to be aware that there is a report or a product being discussed;
- This might mean a reorganization of the web site, and the web site is already scheduled for discussion on the October agenda;
- An observation that it is bothersome that information goes out in a relatively broad distribution prior to the time all clearance has been done, yet without it the information is not available in a timely manner;
- An observation that the job today is to stimulate some thinking about the issue, which will develop into detailed discussion about both the web site and related issues of tracking;
- A reminder that the purpose in workgroups is different than the purpose in public meetings, being more technically oriented to resolve issues raised in the public forum;
- Requiring workgroups to report to the public could obscure the opportunity for technical work and ultimately lengthen the process unduly;
- A workgroup product which ends up being a major determinant in how a decision is rendered at the full Board level, the work product upon which that decision is made should be made publicly available before the Board vote is taken.

* * * * *

UPDATE ON CONTACT MADE TO DOE AND DOL REGARDING CHAPMAN VALVE

Materials were provided to the Board. **Dr. Wade** wrote to both agencies and those drafts were made available to the Board before being mailed on August 8th. One response was received from DOL on August 22nd and has been forwarded to Board members. No response has yet been received from DOE, although he has been told one is forthcoming.

Invitations to the October meeting have been extended to both agencies, and nothing is considered late at this point. **Dr. Wade** solicited any guidance the Board wished to offer leading up to that meeting.

The Department of Labor committed to being in attendance. There was a query as to whether there will be someone to directly address **Dr.**

Wade's letter. It was agreed that if there was no word from Department of Energy, they would be recontacted prior to the meeting.

* * *

Petitioner Comment

Ms. Mary Ann Reale, representing Chapman Valve SEC petitioners, thanked the Board and the individual members for considering the petition. An e-mail regarding petitioner concerns has been circulated to Board members.

* * *

Dr. Wade confirmed Chapman Valve will be on the agenda for the October Board meeting.

* * * * *

WORKGROUP UPDATES

Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction **Mr. Mark Griffon, Chair**

Mr. Griffon indicated there will be a meeting on September 12 in Cincinnati, with the main focus being the fourth, fifth and sixth sets of cases. Matrices on all three are in various stages of comment resolution. The sixth set is awaiting NIOSH response, expected soon, and will be distributed to the subcommittee members. It is hoped one, if not two, matrices will be closed out by the October Board meeting.

DR tasks for various Board teams for set seven has been scheduled. Members should look at the schedule and confirm with **Ms. Kathy Behling** their availability for those phone calls.

* * *

Blockson Chemical SEC Petition Workgroup **Ms. Wanda Munn, Chair**

Ms. Munn reported the workgroup had met in Cincinnati on the 28th of August and their productive discussion resulted in a few action items. Several crucial questions haven't been resolved. One of most concern is that process at Blockson hasn't been as thoroughly identified as they would like. There will be an attempt to meet with Blockson workers on September 12 to clarify some of the memories with respect to chemical process and their reactions from it.

The workgroup spent some time framing three specific questions from the various issues, and those will be in the hands of the petitioners in advance of the meeting so they'll have the opportunity to think about them. Discussion will not be limited to those items. They are asking that anyone with knowledge focus on them so they may be able to come away from the meeting with additional understanding helpful to resolve the final issues.

There was a list of work items for NIOSH, including action items to check literature, available data, same type of operations. There will be a file sweep to make sure there's no outstanding information that hasn't been incorporated. NIOSH will contact the union reps before the September 12 meeting to get those questions in their hands. NIOSH will do a white paper on whether to address products as type M or type S.

The workgroup hopes to have feedback from next week's meeting with the workers and to have a thorough report available for the October Board meeting.

* * *

Chapman Valve SEC Petition Workgroup
Dr. Genevieve Roessler (for Dr. John Poston, Chair)

Dr. Roessler reported the workgroup had not met since the last Board meeting, and the update given earlier in this meeting is all that is available.

* * *

Conflict of Interest Policy Workgroup
Dr. James Lockey, Chair

The workgroup has heard nothing from the Legal Department and is therefore awaiting direction from them. **Dr. Wade** commented that is an issue that has been placed on hold, and he did not at the moment know if or when it would be taken off hold. He indicated the workgroup would be kept posted.

* * *

Fernald Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup
Mr. Bradley Clawson, Chair

The workgroup held the original first meeting on the SEC petition approximately a month ago and worked through the matrix. They found

NIOSH had a good bit of new information the workgroup hadn't been able to go over. Since that time **Mark Rolfes** with NIOSH has gotten a lot of that material placed onto the O drive. The workgroup is currently waiting to be able to go through the information, give SC&A an opportunity to look at the information, and then set up another workgroup meeting shortly.

* * *

Hanford Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup
Dr. Jim Melius, Chair

The workgroup is awaiting NIOSH's evaluation report on the SEC petition, due out shortly. The workgroup will be meeting soon, but there've been a number of changes and some additional comments from SC&A. The workgroup should be able to engage fairly quickly, but it didn't make sense to do so until the new evaluation report is issued.

* * *

Los Alamos Site Profile and SEC Petition Workgroup
Mr. Mark Griffon, Chair

The workgroup has not yet met. They hope to do so shortly after the Board meeting in October.

* * *

Linde Ceramics Site Profile Workgroup
Dr. Genevieve Roessler, Chair

Some of the information was just released last Friday so likely not all workgroup members are aware of it. Their last meeting was on March 26th when they looked at SC&A's review of the site profile documents. Urinalysis data was identified that needed to be reviewed before they could continue. They hoped to have the issue resolved by end of June and meet again, but were notified of a delay -- funding issues, site experts were changed. Last Friday they were informed **Joe Guido** would be working on the data. The urinalysis data was located at Oak Ridge and is being declassified. Once reviewed and analyzed, another workgroup meeting will be scheduled.

* * *

Nevada Test Site Workgroup
Ms. Wanda Munn (for Mr. Robert Presley, Chair)

With **Mr. Presley** not on the line at the time, **Ms. Munn** announced a workgroup meeting scheduled for October 25th in Cincinnati. Some of the material being generated for their use will not be available prior to that time.

* * *

Rocky Flats Workgroup
Mr. Mark Griffon, Chair

No update was available from this workgroup.

* * *

Savannah River Site Workgroup
Mr. Mark Griffon, Chair

This workgroup's status is the same as that for Los Alamos. Some progress has been made on action items generated looking at some classified databases, but the workgroup has not been reconvened to consider the information. Work has been going on by NIOSH in the background and after the October Board meeting this workgroup will probably reconvene.

* * *

SEC Issues (including 250-day) Workgroup
Dr. Jim Melius, Chair

Information being sought on Nevada Test Site has been received recently. Discussions were held with **Dr. Arjun Makhijani** from SC&A last week and it is hoped a workgroup meeting can be arranged later in September or around the time of the October meeting. Schedules have to be coordinated.

* * *

Use of Surrogate Data Workgroup
Dr. Jim Melius, Chair

Dr. Melius has been in discussions with **Dr. Mauro**, who is doing an inventory of procedures, site profiles, et cetera, where surrogate data has been used to get a general ability to identify types of surrogate data. That could be ready in the next couple of weeks, and the plan is to hold a workgroup conference call to plan what further work is needed by SC&A before the workgroup holds a meeting. It is hoped that call will take place before the October meeting.

* * *

Worker Outreach Workgroup
Mike Gibson, Chair

The workgroup submitted to OCAS a request for information, and **Mr. Larry Elliott**, OCAS Director, has appointed **Mr. J. J. Johnson** to be their point of contact. The material is being gathered. Training is being scheduled on the WISPR database that tracks worker comments. That training will include **Ms. Munn's** Blockson workgroup and is scheduled to happen sometime in mid-September.

Mr. Gibson commented he would attend a worker outreach meeting in Joliet, Illinois to get a better feel of how the meetings go.

* * *

Procedures Review Workgroup
Ms. Wanda Munn, Chair

The workgroup has had a heavy-duty paper load and more than one matrix to deal with and has gone through the current matrix only partially during the recent meeting at the end of August, although they did work through all of the outstanding items from the first matrix. While there are very few items outstanding, there are some. An action item list of 14 items has been devised, many of which are NIOSH items. **Ms. Munn** remarked her action item was to make, during this call, the request that OTIB-54 be reviewed by SC&A. That has been done. The action item list will be in the hands of the entire workgroup later in the week so that NIOSH and SC&A will have a clear picture of what is to be done.

It is anticipated that the next meeting of the workgroup will be just prior to the October meeting to see how many of the action items can be cleared, and taking up the remainder of the matrix items yet to be addressed.

* * * * *

**STATUS OF AND PLANS FOR
FUTURE BOARD ACTIVITIES**

Dr. Ziemer noted part of the status issue is how to keep track of what's going on, where the Board is on various site profile reviews, SEC reviews, et cetera. He reported he and **Dr. Wade** have worked to develop a master matrix to further that tracking. Last week they reviewed an early version, currently an Excel spreadsheet, which has a

lot of columns. It continues to expand, and it is hoped it will soon be in a form that can be updated monthly.

* * *

Dr. Wade announced everything had been scheduled for October and that everybody should have received notification of the hotel. The calendar is out through next June. He indicated in October he will try to extend it out through next October with some proposed dates.

Workgroups and subcommittees happen quickly and those mechanisms should continue to be used to advance the Board's work.

* * *

It was announced that **Dr. Christine Branche** is working with **Dr. Wade** to learn the business of the Designated Federal Official and other activities, and will gradually be moving into that position. **Dr. Wade** indicated they will share those responsibilities for some time to come. Everyone will have an opportunity to meet **Dr. Branche** at the October meeting.

* * *

Following a request for Board member comments on future activities, it was suggested a brief discussion on the January '08 meeting would be helpful, with it being finalized in October. It was determined Las Vegas is a likely site unless something comes up in October that would change that perception.

* * * * *

BOARD WORKING TIME

Noting this time is generally set aside for particular issues, motions that had to be worded, et cetera, **Dr. Ziemer** observed there didn't appear to be any such matters to be resolved.

* * * * *

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:09 p.m.

End of Summary Minutes

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Summary Minutes September 4, 2007
NIOSH/CDC Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health

I hereby confirm these Summary Minutes are
accurate, to the best of my knowledge.

Paul L. Ziemer, Ph.D., Chair

Date